



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,709	08/19/2003	Gerhard Schmid	27392/26878	5110

4743 7590 09/22/2006

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300
SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

WILSON, JOHN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3732

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/643,709

Applicant(s)

SCHMID ET AL.

Examiner

John J. Wilson

Art Unit

3732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 17-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is not teaching in the original disclosure of the light emission element extending out a length approximately equal to its width. Drawings may not be used as a disclosure of specific sizes unless it is disclosed that the drawings are drawn to scale, and as such, this language is held to be new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 17, 18, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al (5899692) in view of Robinson et al (4807599). Davis

Art Unit: 3732

shows a handpiece 700, Figs. 7 and 8, elongated body 770, rear connection element 722 for supply lines, forward end light emission element 620, 630, column 5, lines 62-67 and column 7, lines 37-44, fluid outlet opening as shown. Davis shows the light emission element releasably connected to the forward end by threads, and as such, Davis does not show using a latching device. Robinson teaches using a latching device 22, which can spring inward and out to latch a light emission element 14. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Davis to include a latch means as shown by Robinson in order to make use of art known ways to best attach a light emission element to a handpiece. To locate the latch on the light emission element would be an obvious matter of choice in the reversal of the location of known elements to the skilled artisan. As to claim 3, Davis shows a light emission element that has an extending length that is not substantially longer than its width. The specific alignment of the elements would be an obvious matter of choice in location of the known element to one of ordinary skill in the art. As to claim 20, the light transmitting element will inherently allow for light to emit from the front and sides. As to claim 21, the specific length to width ratio is an obvious matter of choice in size to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 9-12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al (5899692) in view of Robinson et al (4807599) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Schlachter (4648838). The above combination does not show a cannula. Schlachter shows a cannula 5. It would be obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to modify the above combination to include a cannula as shown by Schlachter in order to direct the fluid and light to the desired area.

Claim Language

Claim language such as noted in claim 5, "standing up" and "adjoining remaining region" appears to be from a foreign translation. Application should check all of the claim language and place in U.S. form.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 27, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant traverses the holding of obviousness of the location of the latch on the light emission element, however, it is held that this holding is proper because there is no criticality disclosed as to the specific location, and because, it has been established that a mere reversal in the location of the elements would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, *In re Einstein*, 8 USPQ 167. With respect to claim 3, Davis shows a light emission element 620, 630, and as shown in the drawings, the extending length is not substantially longer than the width. Applicant's disclosure does not define the length and width of the light emission element and the drawings are not disclosed as being drawn to scale, and as such, the best that can be gleaned from the disclosure is that the light emissions element is longer than its width. The limitation substantially longer is very broad in view of the lack of disclosure defining the terminology, and as such, Davis is held to properly meet this language.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Wilson whose telephone number is 571-272-4722). The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cris Rodriguez, can be reached at 571-272-4964). The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "John J. Wilson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long, sweeping underline that extends to the left.

John J. Wilson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3732

jjw
September 17, 2006